

2 November 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM : NAPA Project Group

SUBJECT : NAPA Report on the CIA Personnel Management System

1. The Project Group has completed its assigned task to assess the NAPA Report and make implementing recommendations based on NAPA's observations and conclusions. This memorandum forwards our Report which is comprised of twenty-seven separate studies listed at Tab A. Additional studies related to the NAPA Report but assigned to other groups for action are listed at Tab B.

2. As a guide to the issues to be addressed, the Project Group used a paper prepared by the Office of Personnel that consolidated responses to the NAPA Report of all Agency components and Management Advisory Groups. This paper divided the NAPA findings into four major personnel management issue areas: a framework for the Agency personnel system; personnel selection and development; manpower planning, recruitment, and separation; and personnel program evaluation. The Project Group coordinator assigned individual topics to each Group member who then conducted appropriate research and interviews and prepared a first draft. After in-depth discussion among Group members, a second draft reflecting the Group view was presented to the Plans and Control Staff for review and comment. Subsequently, each issue paper was submitted to the Director of Personnel who conducted a review with all members of the Project Group. It was agreed among all concerned that no action was to be taken until the Group had completed all studies and had the opportunity to review the total package to assure compatibility of all recommendations. This has now been done.

3. We considered suggesting some rank order as a priority guide for consideration of our recommendations, but ultimately decided that from our vantage point this would be of marginal value. Of the twenty-seven issues addressed, however, there are several the Project Group views to be of major significance because of the far-reaching impact the proposed actions would have on the personnel management system. These are:

- °Flow-Through Policy
- °Low Three Percent Out Concept
- °Competitive Evaluation Panels
- °Decision-Making Role of Panels
- °Evaluation Panel Functions
- °Personnel Management Evaluation Program
- °Authorities of the Director of Pe

25X1

4. The Project Group has over the past four months examined the Agency's personnel management system with an intensity and from a perspective not normally associated with our individual Directorate responsibilities. Unanimity of views on the intent of some NAPA observations or what recommendations should be made did not come easily at times. In general, however, consensus melded smoothly as occasional parochialism dwindled in favor of commonality of Agency interest. Several of the issues identified by NAPA seemed in our view to be related primarily to the Operations Directorate, although NAPA presented them as Agency wide issues. This caused some problems for the Project Group in its effort to examine each issue in an Agency wide context. Consequently, there were moments when we considered recommending the DO be recognized as an "unique" organization with a mission and personnel situation very much different from the rest of the Agency, and that it should be allowed to operate under its own set of personnel management guidelines. We ultimately rejected this concept as not being in the best interest of all employees, also concluding that it would work counter to a continued nurturing of a "one-Agency." With this consideration put to rest, the central theme for all the Group's recommendations became consistency in approach to personnel management but with provision for some flexibility of application by line management.

5. There is one issue the Project Group would like to address here that indirectly captured our attention in the early course of examining the NAPA Report coverage and other documents on career development and promotional opportunities, and continued to be a topic of conversation throughout our assignment. Our concern is over what appears to be a creeping tendency within the Agency to view promotions during one's career as a process without end. There seems to be an attitude among some employees that once a person reaches a certain level of achievement--be it at the professional journeyman, senior secretary or top clerical level--opportunity for future promotion should continue to be provided, based on longevity and a record of demonstrated hard, satisfactory work even if there is no attendant increase of responsibility. We see reflections of this attitude in recommendations from various quarters to up-grade certain clerical positions, to establish elevated master journeyman grades as well as senior analyst positions at the supergrade level, and even to make promotions that result in FRAs. This apparent attitude on promotion, moreover, seems to be encouraged by management pronouncements that set annual promotion targets, talk of seeking ways to increase headroom and promotional opportunities and encourage all employees who meet promotion standards to expect satisfactory career progress.

6. Management intentions are not in doubt on this matter; they are to encourage excellence and provide continuing opportunity for career development (with promotion as one aspect). This is a worthy goal that indeed should be pursued. We feel, however, that in the process a level of expectation with regard to promotions is being generated that cannot be met in most instances, especially at a time of shrinking manpower resources and money restraints.

7. We suggest that management, along with its deliberations on the Project Group's report on the NAPA study, give attention to this matter. We recommend consideration be given to providing--in appropriate Personnel Management Regulations, Notices, Directorate Handbooks, EOD orientations, etc.--information to employees on what constitutes reasonable career aspirations and what obligation the Agency has to provide opportunity for meeting these personal goals. The elements of competitiveness, excellence and potential--not just headroom or longevity--should be stressed as key factors for selection beyond the journeyman level to senior positions.

8. The Project Group wants to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the excellent support provided by officers in the Office of Personnel. Requested computer runs and historical files were promptly provided, and the review process at all levels was most constructive. This has been a rare opportunity for non-personnel careerists to become involved in a task the outcome of which will impact on every employee in the Agency. Our hope is that the Project Group Report provides positive and practical means of action (including maximum flexibility for line management) for implementing the recommendations of the NAPA Study. We are pleased to concur in the NAPA finding that "the CIA's basic personnel system is sound--one which most Federal agencies would envy for its flexibility and its potential for responsiveness to management needs" . . . and that "Indeed, the Agency components have been served well by the present system." We would hope that contrary views among some employees--although they certainly should be considered--be measured in this context.

Issues in NAPA Report Addressed
by the NAPA Project Group

A Framework for the Agency Personnel System:

Scope and Limitations of the DCI's Authorities
Criteria for Changes
Personnel Policy - Approval and Publication of
Regulations
Authorities of the Director of Personnel
Role of Personnel Officers
OP Focal Point for Component Personnelists
Office of Personnel Operational Activities
"E" Career Service

Personnel Selection and Development:

CT Selection and Placement
Vacancy Notice System
Movement Into Professional Ranks
Occupational Career Systems
Rotational Assignment Policy
Competitive Evaluation Panels
Decision-Making Role of Panels
Evaluation Panel Functions
Uniform Precepts for Panels
Labeling Positions as Professional and Clerical

Manpower Planning, Recruitment and Separation:

Flow-Through Policy

Personnel Reductions

Low Three Percent Out Concept

Non-Competitive Transfers

Agency's Obligation to Employees

Personnel Program Evaluation:

Personnel Management Evaluation Program

Costs of Personnel Administration

Personal Rank Assignments

LWOP for Employee Spouses

Issues in NAPA Report Being Addressed by Other Groups

- ° Set Guidelines on Use of Classification Act Standards - OP/PMCD
- ° Shorten Recruitment Process - IG Staff
- ° Establish System to Resurface Applicant Files - IG Staff
- ° Eliminate Overlap in Employee Orientation - OP, OTR, OMS
- ° Redesign APP - OP, ODP
- ° Redesign PDP - OP
- ° Develop Executive Program - OP - SIS Support Staff
- ° Determine Data Needs - OP
- ° Develop Uniform Qualification Standards - Selection Guidelines Task Force

SECRET

DISAPPEARS
IN THREE
YEARS →

Short-
Term
1-3 Yrs.

SIS 5, 4 & 3

SUCCESSION PLANNING

- EXCOM Develops Key Position List
- Heads Career Services Nominate Candidates
- DCI/DDCI Select Candidates
- Executive Development Panel Approves Any Short-Term Development Training

Long-Term
Succession
Planning and Training
3-5 Yrs.

SIS 1, 2 and 3's

SUCCESSION PLANNING - EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

- Executive Development Panel Approves Key Position List Submitted by Heads Career Services
- Selected and Recommended by Head Career Service
- Assignments and Development Training Approved and Monitored by Executive Development Panel

Long-Term Development
Feeder Group

GS-14 and GS-15

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

- Selected by Career Service Board
- Approved by Head of Career Service
- Development Includes:
 - Managerial Courses
 - Rotational Assignments
- Monitored by Career Service Board

Long-Term Development
5-10 Year Plans

Senior Journeyman Level

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

- Candidates Selected by Sub-Group Panels and Approved by Senior Operating Official
- Development in Accordance with Profiles in Directorate Handbook
- Carried on Enhanced PDP
- Monitored by Sub-Group Panel